

Review of: "[Case Report] High Bifurcation and Anatomical Variation of the Brachial Artery"

Andy Petroianu¹

¹ Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Editor,

I gratefully acknowledge the opportunity to revise this interesting paper.

I do not recommend the publication of this manuscript in its present form due to the following aspects:

- 1 - The anatomical structures should be adequately cited with what they are: muscle (m), artery (a) vein (v) bone, etc. When the authors cite only the the name without previous identification of what kind of structure is, it is no possible to know what they are describing.
- 2 - Conclusion is always the response to the purpose of the study. The conclusion of this paper is completely out of the purpose. It is a discussion without scientific support of what was not studied. This is a not clinically important anatomical variation. "Sutor ne supra crepidam". Please ask them to look for this sentence
- 3 - After revision, this paper may be accepted only as a stimulus for students who are doing a good job.